



June 14, 2013

By Electronic Filing (ECF) Only

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk of the Court
 United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit
 Thurgood Marshall U.S. Courthouse
 40 Foley Square
 New York, NY 10007

Re: *Roach v. T.L. Cannon Corp.*, No. 13-1383 (pet. filed Apr. 12, 2013)
 Supplemental Authority Letter under Rule 28(j)

Dear Madam Clerk:

Plaintiffs-appellants respectfully call the Court's attention to the recent decision in *Leyva v. Medline Industries Inc.*, ___ F.3d ___, 2013 WL 2306567 (9th Cir. 2013).

Leyva squarely rejects the proposition, embraced by the district court in this case, that the need for individualized damages calculations defeats class certification. *See id.* at *3 ("[T]he presence of individualized damages cannot, by itself, defeat class certification under Rule 23(b)(3)."). *Leyva* recognizes that, because "damages determinations are individual in nearly all wage-and-hour class actions," to hold otherwise would effectively bar the certification of virtually all wage-and-hour classes. *Id.*

The Ninth Circuit also considered the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Comcast Corp. v. Behrend*, 133 S. Ct. 1426 (2013), which was the basis for the district court's decision to deny certification here. *Comcast*, the Ninth Circuit rightly noted, stands for the "the plaintiffs must be able to show that their damages stemmed from the defendant's actions that created the legal liability," *Leyva*, 2013 WL 2306567, at *3 — not the proposition, adopted by the district court here, that plaintiffs must offer a "model of damages susceptible of measurement across the entire putative . . . class." Dkt. 114 (Pet. App. 1, at 9-10).

By rejecting the rule the district court applied in this case and by distinguishing *Comcast*, *Leyva* bolsters plaintiffs' "substantial showing that the district court's decision is questionable," *In re Sumitomo Copper Litig.*, 262 F.3d

134, 139 (2d Cir. 2001), which is one of the reasons why review is warranted here. *See* Pet. 10-16.

For the foregoing reasons, as well as those discussed in plaintiffs-appellants' Petition, this Court should grant the petition to appeal under Rule 23(f).

Dated: June 14, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

J. Nelson Thomas
Michael J. Lingle
Annette Gifford
THOMAS & SOLOMON LLP
693 East Avenue
Rochester, NY 14607
(585) 272-0540

Scott Michelman
Michael T. Kirkpatrick
PUBLIC CITIZEN LITIGATION GROUP
1600 20th Street NW
Washington, DC 20009
(202) 588-1000

Frank S. Gattuso
Dennis G. O'Hara
O'HARA, O'CONNELL & CIOTOLI
7207 East Genesee Street
Fayetteville, NY 13066
(315) 451-3810

Attorneys for Plaintiffs-Appellants